UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,104	06/04/2001	Robert E. Haines	10003219-1	6048

7590 01/07/2009

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
SHINGLES, KRISTIE D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2441	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/874,104	HAINES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KRISTIE D. SHINGLES	2441	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 October 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5,6,8-11,15 and 17-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,5,6,8-11,15 and 17-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8 and 21 have been amended.
Claims 2, 4, 7, 12-14 and 16 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-11, 15 and 17-23 are pending.

Response to Arguments

I. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 10/13/2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, Appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is a non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendment, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

II. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

III. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sears, Jr. et al* (US 6,934,736) in view of *Combar et al* (US 7,058,600).

a. **Regarding claim 1**, *Sears, Jr. et al* teach a method of requesting a resource having a URL from a WEB server, comprising:

- a Web client transmitting a first request to a remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL (*Abstract, Figures 3 and 4, col.9 lines 4-11, col.11 lines 61-63—client request cookie associated with a selected website from the cookie server*); then
- a Web client receiving a first cookie from the remote computer (*col.2 lines 45-49, col.9 line 28-col.10 line 2—the client receives a cookie from the cookie server*); and
- a Web client transmitting both the first cookie and a request for the resource to the WEB Server (*Figure 3, col.2 lines 49-51—client then connects to the website and provides the cookie to the website*).

Sears, Jr. et al's teaching of connecting to the desired website and providing the cookie to the website implies that the website request and the cookie are both sent to a web server in order to access a customized resource from the website (*col.11 lines 56-60*). However, *Sears, Jr. et al* fail to explicitly teach the Web client receiving input from a user defining the URL; wherein the first request transmitting step is automatically performed in response to receiving the user input; the WEB client receiving the resource and a second cookie from the WEB server; and in response to receiving the second cookie, the WEB client transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer for storage. Nonetheless, *Combar et al* explicitly teach that the client includes the cookie in the request for content to the server and transmitting the newly generated, unique cookie to a web server, dispatch server or separate cookie jar server for storage (*col.7 lines 27-41*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Combar et al* for transmitting a cookie with the request for a web resource and storing the cookie in a remote storage, in order to customize the requested web document accordingly with the user's information and maintain the user's cookie data in a separate location for added security and extended accessibility.

b. **Claim 21** contains limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Regarding claim 3**, *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Combar et al* teach the method of claim 2, *Sears, Jr. et al* further teach wherein the first request transmitting step is performed by transmitting the first request over a network to the remote computer (*col.9 lines 4-11, col.11 lines 61-63; Combar et al—col.7 lines 27-41*).

d. **Regarding claim 5,** *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Combar et al* teach the method of claim 3, *Sears, Jr. et al* further teach wherein the network comprises the INTERNET (*col.5 lines 23-25; Combar et al—col.10 lines 31-42*).

IV. Claims 15, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Quatrano et al* (US 6,748,420) in view of *Combar et al* (US 7,058,600).

a. **Per claim 15,** *Quatrano et al* teach a system comprising:

- a first WEB client (*col.5 lines 3-8*);
- a second WEB client (*col.5 lines 3-8*);
- a computer remote from the first WEB client and the second WEB client ();
- wherein the first WEB client is operable to: receive a first resource and a first cookie from a first WEB Server and configured to automatically respond thereto

by processing the first resource and transmitting the first cookie to a remote computer (*col.7 lines 7-35*); and receive a URL from a user and is responsive thereto by first transmitting a request to the remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL (*col.14 lines 19-55*); and

- wherein the second WEB client is operable to receive a second resource and a second cookie from a second WEB server and configured to automatically respond thereto by processing the second resource and transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer (*col.7 lines 36-60, col.9 lines 1-28, col.15 lines 27-42*); and

- wherein the remote computer is operable to receive the request from the first WEB client and is responsive thereto by: (a) transmitting the stored first cookie to the first WEB client if the stored first cookie is valid for the URL; and (b) transmitting the stored second cookie to the first WEB client if the stored second cookie is valid for the URL (*col.23 line 27-col.24 line 30—transmitting the cookie with the HTTP URL request and for each user if the cookie is valid for the requested web page*).

Quatrano et al fail to explicitly teach wherein the remote computer is operable to receive the first cookie from the first WEB client and to then store the first cookie; and wherein the remote computer is operable to receive the second cookie from the second WEB client and to then store the second cookie; and. Nonetheless, *Combar et al* teach that the client includes the cookie in the request for content to the server and transmitting the newly generated, unique cookie to a web server, dispatch server or separate cookie jar server for storage (*col.7 lines 27-41*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Quatrano et al* with *Combar et al* for transmitting a cookie with the request for a web resource to multiple users and storing the cookie in a remote storage, in order to customize the requested web document accordingly with the user's information and maintain the user's cookie data in a separate location for added security and extended accessibility.

b. **Claim 23** contains limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 15 and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Regarding claim 17**, *Quatrano et al* with *Combar et al* teach the system of claim 15, *Quatrano et al* further teach the system further comprising a monitoring device operable to monitor a first device to detect when the device generates a pre-defined signal and to respond thereto by generating a notification that the signal was generated; and wherein the first WEB client and the second WEB client are operable by a user to retrieve the notification (*col.25 lines 32-57, col.26 line 45-col.27 line 21, col.28 lines 3-28*).

V. Claims 6, 8-11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sears, Jr. et al* (US 6,934,736) in view of *Quatrano et al* (US 6,748,420).

a. **Regarding claim 6**, *Sears, Jr. et al* teach a computing device, comprising:

- means for receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URLs from a first WEB client (*col.2 lines 45-49, col.9 line 28-col.10 line 2*);
- means for receiving a first request for a cookie that is valid for a first URL (*Abstract, Figures 3 and 4, col.9 lines 4-11, col.11 lines 61-63—client request cookie associated with a selected website from the cookie server*);
- and means for responding to the first request by transmitting the first cookie (*Figures 3 and 4, col.2 lines 45-49, col.9 line 28-col.10 line 2*).

Yet *Sears, Jr. et al* fail to explicitly teach receiving a first request for a cookie from a second WEB client different from the first WEB client, and transmitting the first cookie to the second WEB client if the first URL is within the first range of URLs. However *Quatrano et al* teach the sharing of cookies among a group of web clients, wherein a cookie for transmitted to a first user may also be sent to a second user upon request for the URL (*col.7 lines 26-col.8*

line 52, col.9 lines 16-43, col.15 lines 27-42, col.16 lines 1-7, col.21 lines 45-57, col.22 lines 45-54, col.23 lines 41-60, col.24 lines 41-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Quatrano et al* in order to provide shared access of a website to multiple users, by permitting the sharing of cookies from one client to another without compromising the privacy of each client's information.

b. **Claims 9, 10 and 22** are substantially equivalent to claim 6 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Regarding claim 8**, *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Quatrano et al* teach the computing device of claim 6, *Quatrano et al* further teach wherein the first cookie receiving means is configured to receive the first cookie from the first WEB client over a network; and wherein the first request responding means is configured to transmit the first cookie to the send WEB client over the network (*col.16 lines 1-7, col.21 lines 45-57, col.22 lines 45-54, col.23 lines 41-60, col.24 lines 41-55*).

d. **Regarding claim 11**, *Sears, Jr. et al* with *Quatrano et al* teach the computing device of claim 10, *Sears, Jr. et al* further teach wherein the network comprises the INTERNET (*col.5 lines 23-25; Quatrano et al—col.12 lines 56-60*).

VI. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Quatrano et al* (US 6,748,420) in view of *Combar et al* (US 7,058,600) and further in view of *Silverbrook et al* (US 6,813,039).

a. **Regarding claim 18**, *Quatrano et al* with *Combar et al* teach the system of claim 17, as applied above, yet fail to teach a printer. However, *Silverbrook et al* teach a printer wherein the sensing device that monitors the status of the printer (*Abstract, col.24 lines 6-8*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Quatrano et al* and *Combar et al* with *Silverbrook et al* by having a monitoring device for a printer; because this allows the users to monitor the printer's status to determine when maintenance is required.

b. **Regarding claim 19**, *Quatrano et al* and *Combar et al* with *Silverbrook et al* teach the system of 18, *Silverbrook et al* further teach the system comprising: the printer; and wherein the printer includes a replaceable consumable cartridge; and wherein the printer is operable to generate the signal when a consumable in the cartridge moves below a pre-determined level (*col.23 line 50*).

c. **Regarding claim 20**, *Quatrano et al* and *Combar et al* with *Silverbrook et al* teach the system of claim 19, *Silverbrook et al* further teach wherein the printer is a laser printer (*col.15 lines 30-32*).

Conclusion

VII. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure: Starkovich et al (6715080), Brandt et al (6377993), Devine et al (6631402), Paltenghe et al (6421729), Bladow et al (6115040).

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the reference(s) applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the

individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the Applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the cited passages as taught by the prior art or relied upon by the examiner. Should Applicant amend the claims of the claimed invention, it is respectfully requested that Applicant clearly indicate the portion(s) of Applicant's specification that support the amended claim language for ascertaining the metes and bounds of Applicant's claimed invention.

VIII. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2441

/KDS/
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444